

The L_x - T and L_x - σ Relationships for Galaxy Clusters Revisited

Xiang-Ping Wu and Yan-Jie Xue

National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100012, China

and

Li-Zhi Fang

Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

Received October 30 1998; accepted May 7 1999

ABSTRACT

The relationships between the X-ray determined bolometric luminosity L_x , the temperature T of the intracluster gas, and the optical measured velocity dispersion σ of the cluster galaxies are updated for galaxy clusters using the largest sample of 256 clusters drawn from literature. The newly established relationships, based on the doubly weighted orthogonal distance regression (ODR) method, are justified by both their self-consistency and co-consistency, which can then be used to test the theoretical models of cluster formation and evolution. The observationally determined L_x - T and L_x - σ relationships, $L_x \propto T^{2.72 \pm 0.05} \propto \sigma^{5.24 \pm 0.29}$, are marginally consistent with those predicted in the scenario that both intracluster gas and galaxies are in isothermal and hydrostatic equilibrium with the underlying gravitational potential of clusters. A comparison between these observed and predicted L_x - T relationships also suggests that the mean cluster baryon fraction f_b remains approximately constant among different clusters, $f_b \approx 0.17$, which gives rise to a low-mass density universe of $\Omega_m \approx 0.3$.

Subject headings: cosmology: observations — galaxies: clusters: general — X-rays: galaxies

1. Introduction

Over the past few years, there has been an increase in the observational and theoretical studies of the relationships between the X-ray determined bolometric luminosity L_x , the temperature T of the intracluster gas and the optical measured velocity dispersion σ of the cluster galaxies (e.g. Edge & Stewart 1991a,b; David et al. 1993; Fabian et al. 1994; Girardi et al. 1996; Mushotzky & Scharf 1997; Cavaliere, Menci & Tozzi 1997; Scharf & Mushotzky 1997; White, Jones & Forman 1997; Markevitch 1998; Wu, Fang & Xu 1998; Arnaud & Evrard 1998; Allen & Fabian 1998; etc.). On one hand, because the total X-ray luminosity of a cluster is related to the (gas) baryon number density through thermal bremsstrahlung, while the X-ray temperature and galaxy velocity dispersion are determined by the gravitating mass of the cluster, the L_x - T and L_x - σ relationships constitute a direct and sensitive probe of the volume-averaged baryon fraction f_b of the cluster. On the other hand, because both gas and galaxies are the tracers of the depth and shape of a common gravitational potential in the cluster, the correlation between T (or L_x) and σ provides a crucial test for the dynamical properties of galaxy clusters. Moreover, the possible intrinsic dispersions in the L_x - T , L_x - σ and σ - T relationships are likely to be associated with the cluster merging histories, preheating of intracluster gas, the presence of cooling flows or systematic variations in the baryon fraction with cluster masses. Furthermore, the observed L_x - T , L_x - σ and σ - T relationships may also allow one to constrain the models of structure formation (e.g. Evrard & Henry 1991; Lubin et al. 1996; Mushotzky & Scharf 1997; Donahue et al. 1998; Eke, Navarro & Frenk 1998; etc.).

It has been known since the early days of X-ray astronomy that there exists a strong correlation between the following dynamical properties of clusters: L_x vs T (Mitchell, Ives & Culhane 1977; see Table 2 for a summary), L_x vs σ (Solinger & Tucker 1972) and T vs σ [Smith, Mushotzky & Serlemitsos 1979; For a summary see Table 2 of Wu, Fang & Xu (1998)]. While the accuracies in determinations of these relationships have been significantly improved in recent years with the rapid growth of X-ray/optical data for galaxy clusters, tight constraints on these relationships have not yet been satisfactorily achieved. The main reason is that there may exist intrinsic dispersions in these relationships due to different physical mechanisms among different

clusters. Another reason is the small cluster samples involved in statistics. Yet, there is also a reason related to the inappropriate linear regression methods employed in the fitting process. For the latter a typical example is the fitted σ - T relationship for galaxy clusters: The early claim for $\sigma \propto T^{0.50}$, which implies a perfect isothermal and hydrostatic equilibrium for the dynamical state of galaxy clusters (Lubin & Bahcall 1993), has been recently shown to depend on the adopted ordinary standard least-square (OLS) fitting method (Wu, Fang & Xu 1998 and references therein). An apparent deviation of the dynamical state from that predicted by the isothermal and hydrostatic equilibrium model for galaxy clusters is found if the doubly weighted orthogonal distance regression (ODR) is applied for the same data set (σ, T) . Indeed, some of the previous fitted relationships based on a sparse data set, together with the inappropriate linear regression methods, could be misleading. The first purpose of this paper is then to demonstrate the uncertainties in the L_x - T and L_x - σ relationships for galaxy clusters arising from the employment of the OLS and ODR fitting methods. To this end, we will use the hitherto largest cluster sample drawn from literature, which enables us to update the cluster L_x - T and L_x - σ relationships and remarkably increase the statistical significance. The reliability of the new relationships will be tested by both self-consistency and co-consistency between different correlations. Next, we will attempt to derive the mean cluster baryon fraction f_b and the average mass density of the Universe from the newly established relationships between L_x , T and σ . Furthermore, we will briefly discuss the possibility of testing various theoretical models and speculations with our L_x - T and L_x - σ relationships. Throughout the paper we assume a Hubble constant of $H_0 = 50 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and a flat cosmological model of $\Omega_0 = \Omega_m = 1$.

2. Sample

By extensively searching the literature, we find 168/193 galaxy clusters for which both the X-ray bolometric luminosity and temperature/velocity dispersion are observationally determined (Table 1). Here, we have excluded those clusters whose L_x , T or σ are derived from indirect methods such as the L_x - T , L_x - σ or σ - T correlations. While this leads to a reduction of cluster

numbers as compared with the largest cluster sample heretofore published by White et al. (1997), we have added many high-redshift and newly discovered X-ray clusters. Since the cluster X-ray luminosities are measured in different energy bands, we convert the observed luminosities to the bolometric luminosities in the rest frame of the clusters according to an optically thin and isothermal plasma emission model, in which we adopted the analytic approximation of the total Gaunt factor given by Mewe et al. (1986) and assumed $T = 6$ keV if the X-ray temperatures are unknown. For some clusters whose X-ray luminosities are originally given within a certain cluster radius, we have made a correction for lost flux falling out the detection apertures by the standard method which assumes a β model with $\beta = 2/3$ and $r_c = 0.25$ Mpc for the X-ray surface brightness distribution. The final sample contains a total of 256 clusters which constitutes the hitherto largest cluster data set for such studies.

3. The L_x - T relationship

Bolometric luminosities L_x against temperatures T for 168 clusters in Table 1 are plotted in Fig.1, in which we have also explicitly illustrated the distributions of the high-redshift ($z > 0.1$) and low-redshift ($z < 0.1$) clusters. While the scatter is large, there is a strong correlation between the two variables. Employing the OLS to the whole data set yields

$$L_x = 10^{-0.92 \pm 0.09} T^{2.61 \pm 0.12}, \quad (1)$$

where (also hereafter) L_x and T are in units of 10^{44} erg s $^{-1}$ and keV, respectively. Since measurement uncertainties remain unknown in some cases, they are not included in the error bars in the above fitting. An immediate impression is that the resulting L_x - T relationship is roughly consistent with previous analyses (see Table 2), in particular the recent result by Markevitch (1998) where the central cooling regions are excluded. Additionally, no apparent difference in the L_x - T distributions is seen among the low- and high-redshift clusters. Next, we extract from Table 1 a subsample of 142 clusters that have measurement uncertainties in both quantities L_x and T

(see Fig.2). We apply respectively the OLS and ODR methods to the subsample, which gives

$$L_x = 10^{-0.86 \pm 0.10} T^{2.52 \pm 0.13}, \quad (\text{OLS}); \quad (2)$$

$$L_x = 10^{-0.92 \pm 0.05} T^{2.72 \pm 0.05}, \quad (\text{ODR}). \quad (3)$$

The error bars in these fits are determined by Monte-Carlo simulations, which have taken the measurement uncertainties in both L_x and T into account.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 1 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 2 HERE.

Although the discrepancy in the fitted L_x - T relationships by different authors has partially arisen from the selection of cluster samples such as whether the cooling clusters are included/excluded (White et al. 1997; Markevitch 1998; Allen & Fabian 1998), another reason is apparently due to the adopted linear regression methods: The ODR fitting method usually provides a steeper slope than that given by the OLS method in the fitted relationships. A similar problem is also reported in the study of the σ - T relationship (Wu, Fang & Xu 1998). Because OLS ignores the scatters in T and only minimizes the residuals in L_x while ODR makes an attempt at accounting for scatters in both T and L_x (Feigelson & Babu 1992), in principle ODR provides a more reasonable fit than OLS for our subsample in the sense that L_x and especially T contain significant measurement uncertainties in addition to their intrinsic scatters (also see White et al. 1997). This can be seen by a self-consistent test: Using L_x as the abscissa variable and repeating the above fitting process, we obtain

$$T = 10^{0.45 \pm 0.01} L_x^{0.28 \pm 0.01}, \quad (168 \text{ points, OLS}); \quad (4)$$

$$T = 10^{0.44 \pm 0.02} L_x^{0.29 \pm 0.01}, \quad (142 \text{ points, OLS}); \quad (5)$$

$$T = 10^{0.34 \pm 0.01} L_x^{0.37 \pm 0.01}, \quad (142 \text{ points, ODR}). \quad (6)$$

If $L_x = 10^a T^b$, we would expect that $T = 10^{-a/b} L_x^{1/b}$. It is immediate that the ODR fitted relationships meet this simple criteria while the OLS results, $L_x \propto T^{2.61}$ (or $T^{2.52}$) and $T \propto L_x^{0.28}$ (or $L_x^{0.29}$), are inconsistent with each other. In summary, based on our cluster sample and the ODR method, we find that at the 3σ level, $L_x \propto T^{2.6} - T^{2.9}$ and $T \propto L_x^{0.34} - L_x^{0.40}$.

4. The L_x - σ relationship

Similarly, the relationship between X-ray bolometric luminosity and galaxy velocity dispersion can be established for a total of 193 clusters in Table 1 and a subsample of 156 clusters whose measurement uncertainties in both L_x and σ are known, respectively,

$$L_x = 10^{-7.06 \pm 0.54} \sigma^{2.67 \pm 0.19}, \quad (193 \text{ points, OLS}); \quad (7)$$

$$L_x = 10^{-6.73 \pm 0.59} \sigma^{2.56 \pm 0.21}, \quad (156 \text{ points, OLS}); \quad (8)$$

$$L_x = 10^{-14.57 \pm 0.94} \sigma^{5.24 \pm 0.29}, \quad (156 \text{ points, ODR}), \quad (9)$$

or

$$\sigma = 10^{2.76 \pm 0.01} L_x^{0.19 \pm 0.01}, \quad (193 \text{ points, OLS}); \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma = 10^{2.75 \pm 0.01} L_x^{0.20 \pm 0.02}, \quad (156 \text{ points, OLS}); \quad (11)$$

$$\sigma = 10^{2.78 \pm 0.03} L_x^{0.19 \pm 0.01}, \quad (156 \text{ points, ODR}), \quad (12)$$

where (also hereafter) σ is in units of km s^{-1} . The data sets (L_x, σ) , together with our best fitted results, are shown in Fig.3 and Fig.4 for 193 and 156 clusters, respectively. Self-consistent test suggests that at the 3σ level, $L_x \propto \sigma^{4.4-6.1}$, which is compatible with the recent work of White et al. (1997) based on 50 clusters and the ODR fitting technique. Recall that the previous studies in terms of the OLS fitting method found that $L_x \propto \sigma^4$ (Quintana & Melnick 1982) or $L_x \propto \sigma^{2.9}$ (Edge & Stewart 1991b).

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 3 HERE.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 4 HERE.

We have further plotted in Fig.5 the σ - T relationship for 105 clusters in Table 1. Applying the ODR fitting technique to the 92 clusters, for which measurement uncertainties in both T and σ are given, yields

$$\sigma = 10^{2.49 \pm 0.03} T^{0.64 \pm 0.02}. \quad (13)$$

This is in good agreement with that given by Wu, Fang & Xu (1998) for a sample of 95 clusters where the calculated X-ray temperatures for some clusters from White et al. (1997) were used. On the other hand, our fitted correlations between L_x and T/σ , $L_x = 10^{-0.92 \pm 0.05} T^{2.72 \pm 0.05}$ and $L_x = 10^{-14.57 \pm 0.94} \sigma^{5.24 \pm 0.29}$, provide

$$\sigma = 10^{2.60 \pm 0.24} T^{0.52 \pm 0.07}. \quad (14)$$

It appears that within a 2σ uncertainty range, the ‘derived’ σ - T relationship is consistent with the observed one [eq.(13)]. This is the first time that the co-consistency between these correlations has been established.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 5 HERE.

5. Cosmic evolution

Different theoretical models predict quite different cosmic evolutionary tendencies for galaxy clusters, and thus an examination of whether the observed X-ray luminosities, temperatures and velocity dispersions of galaxy clusters evolve with redshift may discriminate among these theoretical models. For instance, in the scenario of self-similar hierarchical structure formation of galaxy clusters, the evolution of the cluster population follows $L_x \propto (1+z)^{(7n+5)/(2n+6)}$ and $T \propto \sigma^2 \propto (1+z)^{(n-1)/(n+3)}$, where n is the spectral index of the density perturbation, $P(k) \propto k^n$ (Kaiser 1986). Generally, clusters undergo rapid evolution in such a model. So, by comparing

with X-ray observations, in principle we can test this scenario and thus determine the power index n . Unfortunately, a stringent constraint on the evolutionary models of clusters cannot be set because our X-ray cluster sample (Table 1) is neither from a complete flux-limited survey nor from a temperature-limited one. Nevertheless, the redshift dependence of X-ray luminosities, temperatures and velocity dispersions for all the clusters in Table 1 (see Fig.6) may give useful implications about cluster evolution. It appears that while the scatters are large, evidence for the cosmic evolution of these dynamical quantities is rather weak, which is consistent with the result obtained from studies of cluster temperature evolution (Henry, Jiao & Gioia 1994; Mushotzky & Scharf 1997) and X-ray luminosity function as well as distribution of X-ray core radii of clusters (e.g. Burke et al. 1997; Rosati et al. 1998; Vikhlinin et al. 1998).

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 6 HERE.

6. The mean cluster baryon fraction

For simplicity we assume that the hot X-ray emitting gas in a cluster follows a spherically symmetrical isothermal β model with $\beta = 2/3$. The electron number density is then

$$n_e = n_{e0} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{r_{xc}^2} \right)^{-1}, \quad (15)$$

where n_{e0} and r_{xc} are the central electron number density and the core radius, respectively. In the scenario of the optically thin and isothermal plasma emission, the X-ray bolometric luminosity within a cluster radius r is given by

$$L_x = \frac{2^4 e^6}{3 \hbar m_e c^2} \left(\frac{2 \pi k T}{3 m_e c^2} \right)^{1/2} \mu_e \bar{g}(T) \int n_e^2 4 \pi r^2 dr, \quad (16)$$

where $\bar{g}(T)$ is the average Gaunt factor, and $\mu_e = 2/(1 + X)$ with $X = 0.768$ is the hydrogen mass fraction in the primordial abundances of hydrogen and helium. The gas mass within the same volume is

$$M_{gas} = \mu_e m_p \int n_e 4 \pi r^2 dr. \quad (17)$$

The total gravitating mass of a cluster M_{tot} can be independently derived using the hydrostatic equilibrium equation for X-ray emitting gas and galaxies, respectively,

$$-\frac{GM_{tot}}{r^2} = \frac{kT}{\mu_i m_p} \frac{dn_e}{n_e dr}, \quad (18)$$

$$-\frac{GM_{tot}}{r^2} = \sigma^2 \frac{dn_{gal}}{n_{gal} dr}, \quad (19)$$

where $\mu_i = 0.585$ denotes the mean molecular weight, n_{gal} is the number density of cluster galaxies for which we use

$$n_{gal} = n_{gal,0} \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{r_{gc}^2}\right)^{-\alpha}, \quad (20)$$

$n_{gal,0}$ and r_{gc} are the central galaxy number density and core radius, respectively, and α is the power-law index which has a value of $\alpha = 3/2$ and 1 for the conventional King model and the softened isothermal model, respectively. Defining the (gas) baryon fraction as $f_b = M_{gas}/M_{tot}$, we can write the X-ray bolometric luminosity L_x as

(a) for gas as the tracer of the cluster potential

$$L_x = \frac{2^4 e^6}{3 \hbar m_e c^2} \left(\frac{2\pi kT}{3m_e c^2}\right)^{1/2} \frac{\bar{g}(T)}{\mu_e \mu_i^2} \left(\frac{kT}{Gm_p^2}\right)^2 f_b^2 S_{gas}, \quad (21)$$

where the structure factor S_{gas} is

$$S_{gas} = \frac{1}{2\pi r_{xc}} \left(\frac{r^2}{r^2 + r_{xc}^2}\right)^2 \frac{\tan^{-1} \frac{r}{r_{xc}} - \frac{rr_{xc}}{r^2 + r_{xc}^2}}{\left(1 - \frac{r_{xc}}{r} \tan^{-1} \frac{r}{r_{xc}}\right)^2}; \quad (22)$$

(b) for galaxies as the tracer of the cluster potential

$$L_x = \frac{2^4 e^6}{3 \hbar m_e c^2} \left(\frac{2\pi kT}{3m_e c^2}\right)^{1/2} \frac{\bar{g}(T)}{\mu_e} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{Gm_p}\right)^2 f_b^2 S_{gal}, \quad (23)$$

where the structure factor S_{gal} is

$$S_{gal} = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi r_{xc}} \left(\frac{r^2}{r^2 + r_{gc}^2}\right)^2 \frac{\tan^{-1} \frac{r}{r_{xc}} - \frac{rr_{xc}}{r^2 + r_{xc}^2}}{\left(1 - \frac{r_{xc}}{r} \tan^{-1} \frac{r}{r_{xc}}\right)^2}. \quad (24)$$

In the computation of total X-ray luminosity of the whole cluster, we have $r \gg r_{xc}$ and $r \gg r_{gc}$, which gives $S_{gas} \approx 1/4r_{xc}$ and $S_{gal} \approx \alpha/4r_{xc}$. In addition, the mean Gaunt factor depends only

weakly on gas temperature. Therefore, the X-ray bolometric luminosity scales approximately as
(a) for gas as the tracer of the cluster potential

$$L_x \propto T^{2.5} f_b^2 r_{xc}^{-1}; \quad (25)$$

(b) for galaxies as the tracer of the cluster potential

$$L_x \propto \sigma^4 T^{1/2} f_b^2 r_{xc}^{-1} \propto T^{3.06} f_b^2 r_{xc}^{-1}, \quad (26)$$

in which the σ - T relationship [eq.(13)] has been used.

The fact that the theoretically expected results [eq.(25) and eq.(26)] are marginally consistent with the observationally fitted L_x - T relationship [eq.(3)] indicates that $f_b r_{xc}^{-1}$ remains roughly unchanged for different clusters. The universality of f_b for different clusters is naturally expected since a typical rich cluster draws its matter (baryon + non-baryon) from a region of radius of ~ 20 Mpc which should be large enough to be representative of the matter composition of the Universe. On the other hand, there has been no strong evidence so far for the dependence of the X-ray core radii on temperature (Edge & Stewart 1991a), although a recent study reported a weak trend of increasing core radius with increasing gas temperature (Jones & Forman 1999). In particular, an essentially identical distribution of core radii of nearby and distant luminous clusters has been detected (Vikhlinin et al. 1998), showing that r_{xc} does not evolve significantly with redshift since $z \approx 1$. Therefore, our finding that $f_b r_{xc}^{-1}$ holds statistically constant for clusters within $z \approx 1$ is reasonable.

6.1. X-ray emitting gas as the tracer of cluster potential

If cluster matter composition is representative of the universe, the volumed-average (gas) baryon fractions over the whole cluster should remain the same for different clusters, i.e., $f_b = \text{const}$. Assuming that the gas fraction f_b and core radius r_{xc} are constant for different clusters, and the intracluster gas is in isothermal and hydrostatic equilibrium with the gravitational potential of cluster, we would expect that $L_x \propto T^{2.5}$ in terms of eq.(25), which has a somewhat

flatter slope than that observed [eq.(3)] unless the OLS fitted L_x - T relationships eqs.(1) and (2) are invoked. We plot in Fig.7(b) the ratio of L_x to $T^{2.5}$ for the 168 clusters whose L_x and T are observationally determined. Regardless of the large scatter, the ratio $L_x/T^{2.5}$ is nearly independent of cluster population, with a mean value of $\langle L_x/T^{2.5} \rangle = 0.098 \pm 0.091$. Because there is an apparent asymmetry in the distribution of the $L_x/T^{2.5}$ ratios, we provide the median and 90% limits of the distribution: $\langle L_x/T^{2.5} \rangle = 0.135^{+0.295}_{-0.105}$. This gives rise to the mean cluster gas fraction

$$\begin{aligned} f_b &= 0.195 \left(\frac{L/T^{2.5}}{0.135} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{r_{xc}}{0.25 \text{ Mpc}} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= 0.145^{+0.153+0.081}_{-0.103-0.072}, \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

in which the first uncertainty account for the 90% limits of the $L_x/T^{2.5}$ distribution and the second one arises from the variation of core radius from 0.1 Mpc to 0.5 Mpc. We have used a value of $\bar{g}(T) = 1.2$ for the mean Gaunt factor, which introduces another uncertainty of about 20%.

EDITOR: PLACE FIGURE 7 HERE.

In the self-similar model for the formation of galaxy clusters, if the X-ray emission is dominated by bremsstrahlung, the expected L_x - T relationship eq.(25) reduces to

$$L_x \propto T^2(1+z)^{3/2}, \tag{28}$$

where clusters are assumed to have same f_b and formed at same redshift. In order to test the self-similar models of cluster evolution, we plot the ratio of L_x to $T^2(1+z)^{3/2}$ in Fig.7(c) for our cluster sample (Table 1). It appears that the dispersions are rather large as compared with the similar plot for the $L_x/T^{2.5}$ ratio. Essentially, there is no correlation between L_x and $T^2(1+z)^{3/2}$. The flatter slope of the L_x - T relationship ($L_x \propto T^2$) and the possible L_x evolution with redshift (depending on n) in the self-similar models are apparently contrary to observations. To reconcile with observations, a number of physical mechanisms have been explored such as preheating of the intracluster gas (Ponman, Cannon & Navarro 1999 and references therein) or the influence of cooling flows (Allen & Fabian 1998). Here, we discuss briefly another possibility suggested by

David et al. (1993): One can achieve the observed relationship $L_x \propto T^3$ by simply requiring the baryon fraction to vary as $f_b \propto T^{0.5}$. Although the recent work by Allen & Fabian (1998) arrived at an opposite conclusion that $f_b \propto T^{-0.68 \pm 0.22}$, their gas mass fractions f_b are measured at a relatively small radius of 0.5 Mpc, which may have rather large uncertainties, in addition to the intrinsic dispersion, due to the problem of conventional cluster mass estimates and dynamical activities in the central regions (Wu & Fang 1997; Allen 1998; Wu et al. 1998 and references therein). Indeed, the binding mass of a cluster within the central core could be underestimated by a factor of 2–4 due to the employment of the isothermal and hydrostatic equilibrium hypothesis [eq.(18)]. So, the baryon fraction can be overestimated by a corresponding factor within the cluster core. Nevertheless, the various mass estimators (X-ray, optical and gravitational lensing) can provide a consistent cluster mass on scale greater than the X-ray core. This may explain the decreasing tendency of f_b with T reported by Allen & Fabian (1998) if we notice that $T \propto r^2$ in a self-similar model of cluster growth (e.g. Evrard, Metzler & Navarro 1996). Namely, the cluster baryon fraction might be more significantly overestimated for the low-temperature clusters than the high-temperature ones. However, this speculation needs to be tested by a combined analysis of cluster mass estimates from gravitational lensing and X-ray measurements. In summary, if the baryon fraction of a cluster is dependent on temperature, it may have significant impact on our determination of the universal baryon fraction based on a flux limited cluster sample.

6.2. Galaxies as the tracer of cluster potential

Unlike the diffuse X-ray gas, cluster galaxies are less affected by the presence of the (non)cooling flows, the nonthermal pressure (e.g. magnetic field), preheating (e.g. supernovae), etc. Therefore, there are good reasons that cluster galaxies are a better tracer of the underlying gravitational potential of clusters and their velocity dispersions σ are a good indicator of dark matter. The convincing evidence comes from the excellent agreement between the gravitating masses of clusters derived from the gravitational lensing phenomena and from the velocity dispersion of galaxies as a tracer of cluster potential (Wu & Fang 1997; Wu et al. 1998).

Nevertheless, the expected L_x - T relationship [eq.(26)] under the assumption that galaxies are in hydrostatic equilibrium with the cluster gravitational potential shows a slightly steeper slope than that observed [eq.(3)]. The gas fraction f_b according to eq.(23) is

$$f_b^2 = 3.725 \left(\frac{L_x/T^{3.06}}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{\sigma/T^{0.64}}{100} \right)^{-4} \left(\frac{r_{xc}}{0.25\text{Mpc}} \right) \frac{1}{\alpha}. \quad (29)$$

By fixing the power-law index 3.06 for the L_x - T relationship and 0.64 for the σ - T relationship in the fitting process, we have

$$L_x = 10^{-1.14 \pm 0.03} T^{3.06}, \quad (30)$$

and

$$\sigma = 10^{2.49 \pm 0.02} T^{0.64}. \quad (31)$$

The mean cluster baryon fraction is

$$f_b = 0.172 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.071 \pm 0.034 \pm 0.013 \quad (32)$$

where the first and second error bars account for the uncertainties in the fitted L_x - T and σ - T relationships, respectively, the third and forth ones correspond to the variations of core radius r_{xc} and α in the ranges $0.1 \text{ Mpc} \leq r_{xc} \leq 0.5 \text{ Mpc}$ and $0.7 < \alpha < 1.5$, and the last term is the uncertainty introduced by the mean Gaunt factor. Our statistical estimates of cluster baryon fraction, both eq.(27) and eq.(32), are consistent with the results obtained for many individual clusters based on detailed analysis of the dynamical properties of clusters (e.g. White et al. 1993; David, Jones & Forman 1995; Wu 1998).

6.3. Cosmological density parameter

In conjunction with the standard Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) model (Walker et al. 1991), we can estimate the cosmological density parameter Ω_m from the baryon fractions given above (e.g. White et al. 1993; David et al. 1995). (a) For gas as the tracer of the cluster potential,

$$\Omega_m = 0.30 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.09, \quad (33)$$

in which the first error bar accounts for the uncertainty of the BBN prediction: $\Delta\Omega_b = 0.01$ where Ω_b is the average baryon mass density of the Universe, the second one represents the uncertainty in the fitted L_x - T relationship and the adopted mean Gaunt factor, and the third term reflects the variation of core radius r_{xc} from $r_{xc} = 0.1$ Mpc to $r_{xc} = 0.5$ Mpc. (b) For galaxies as the tracer of the cluster potential

$$\Omega_m = 0.29 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.46, \quad (34)$$

where the first error bar accounts again for the uncertainty of the BBN prediction, and the second one is the combined result of uncertainties in the fitted L_x - T and σ - T relationships and the mean Gaunt factor, and the last one includes the uncertainties due to luminous matter distributions (r_{xc} and α). Strictly speaking, the above estimate of Ω_m is in contradiction with our cosmological model assumed at the first onset: $\Omega_0 = \Omega_m = 1$. We have then re-estimated the X-ray luminosity L_x for each cluster in our subsample by converting the currently used X-ray luminosity in an $\Omega_0 = \Omega_m = 1$ model to that in a flat cosmological model but with a nonzero cosmological constant, $\Omega_m = 0.3$ and $\lambda = 0.7$. Nevertheless, we find that this change has a negligible effect on our L_x - T , L_x - σ and σ - T relationships.

7. Discussion and conclusions

Regardless of possible intrinsic dispersions, overall clusters exhibit a strong correlation between the X-ray luminosity, the temperature of the hot intracluster gas and the velocity dispersion of cluster galaxies. Based on the largest cluster sample drawn from literature and the ODR fitting method, that takes the measurement uncertainties of two variables into account, we have established both self-consistent and co-consistent relationships between these quantities. These relationships may enable us to test theoretical models of cluster formation and evolution and determine the mean baryon fraction and the average mass density of the Universe.

A comparison between the theoretically expected L_x - T and L_x - σ relationships for clusters and the observationally determined ones suggests that both the intracluster gas and galaxies

are marginally in isothermal and hydrostatic equilibrium with the underlying gravitational potential of clusters, which is consistent with the result given by a combined study of cluster mass determinations from the X-ray/optical and gravitational lensing measurements (Allen 1998; Wu et al. 1998). Therefore, it is unlikely that the local dynamical activities can play a dominant role in the recent dynamical evolution of overall clusters. However, neither the X-ray emitting gas nor the cluster galaxies as a tracer of the gravitational potential can precisely reproduce the observed L_x - T relationships. Moreover, our fitted σ - T relationship, $\sigma \propto T^{0.64}$, shows an apparent deviation from that predicted by isothermal and hydrostatic model for galaxy clusters, $\sigma \propto T^{0.5}$. This may have arisen from our oversimplification in modeling the gas/galaxy distributions.

We have shown that the mean cluster (gas) baryon fraction is roughly constant among different clusters with a mean value of $f_b \approx 0.17$, which corresponds to $\Omega_m \approx 0.3$. Indeed, the volume-averaged baryon fractions of different clusters over the whole cluster sizes should be the same, if clusters are a fair sample of the Universe. Our estimated cluster baryon fraction and the average matter density of the Universe are in accordance with the prevailing claim for a low-mass density universe with or without a nonzero cosmological constant.

We have not found convincing evidence for a significant evolution in the dynamical properties of clusters characterized by L_x , T and σ , although the highest redshift cluster at $z \approx 1$ has been included in our cluster sample. This disagrees with the claims by the standard CDM model and the self-similar models for formation and evolution of clusters, but is consistent with the results from numerous recent X-ray observations (e.g. Mushotzky & Scharf 1997; Rosati et al. 1998; etc.) and the predictions by the low-mass density cosmological models.

Apparently, the present conclusions are subject to the incompleteness of our cluster sample, which is neither flux-limited nor temperature-limited (or velocity dispersion-limited). It is likely that there would be a moderate modification to our L_x - T , L_x - σ and σ - T relationships when a large and complete cluster sample becomes available. In particular, the large scatters in these correlations are likely to be associated with the intrinsic properties of clusters, especially the cooling flows in the central regions (Fabian et al. 1994; White et al. 1997; Markevitch 1998;

Allen & Fabian 1998), which have not been separated in our fitting processes. Finally, future investigations should be made towards a deep understanding of the physical mechanisms for the reported L_x - T , L_x - T and σ - T relationships.

We gratefully acknowledge the insightful comments and suggestions by an anonymous referee. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China, under Grant No. 19725311.

REFERENCES

- Abramopoulos, F., & Ku, W. H.-M., 1983, *ApJ*, 271, 446
- Adami, C., Mazure, A., Biviano, A., Katgert, P., & Rhee, G., 1998, *A&A*, 331, 493
- Allen, S. W., 1998, *MNRAS*, 296, 392
- Allen, S. W., & Fabian, A. C., 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, L57
- Andreani, P., et al., 1999, *ApJ*, in press
- Arnaud, M., & Evrard, A. E., 1999, *MNRAS*, in press
- Akritas, M. G., & Bershadsky, M. A., 1996, *ApJ*, 470, 706
- Barmby, P., & Huchra, J., P., 1998, *AJ*, 115, 6
- Bardelli, S., et al., 1996, *A&A*, 305, 435
- Bird, C. M., 1995, *ApJ*, 445, L81
- Bird, C. M., Mushotzky, R. F., & Metzler, C. A., 1995, *ApJ*, 453, 40
- Böhringer, H., Tanaka, Y., Mushotzky, R. F., Ikebe, Y., & Hattori, M., 1998, *A&A*, 334, 789
- Briel, U. G., & Henry, J. P., 1993, *A&A*, 278, 379
- Buote, D. A., 1999, *ApJ*, submitted (astro-ph/9903278)
- Burke, D. J., Collins, C. A., Sharples, R. M., Romer, A. K., Holden, B. P., & Nichol, R. C., 1997, *ApJ*, 488, L121
- Burns, J. O., et al., 1996, *ApJ*, 467, L49
- Carlberg, R. G., et al., 1996, *ApJ*, 462, 32
- Castander, F. J., Ellis, R. S., Frenk, C. S., Dressler, A., & Gunn, J. E., 1994, *ApJ*, L79
- Cavaliere, A., Menci, N., & Tozzi, P., 1997, *ApJ*, 484, L21
- Danese, L., De Zotti, G., & di Tullio, G., 1980, *A&A*, 82, 322
- Dantas, C. C., De Carvalho, R. R., Capelato, H. V., & Mazure, A., 1997, *ApJ*, 485, 447

- David, L., Forman, W., & Jones, C., 1999, ApJ, in press
- David, L. P., Jones, C., & Forman, W., 1995, ApJ, 445, 578
- David, L. P., Slyz, A., Jones, C., Forman, W., & Vrtilek, S. D., 1993, ApJ, 412, 479
- De Grandi, S., et al., 1999, ApJ, in press
- Donahue, M., Voit, G. M., Gioia, I., Luppino, G., Hughes, J. P., & Stocke, J. T., 1998, ApJ, 502, 550
- Dressler, A., 1978, ApJ, 226, 55
- Dressler, A., et al., 1999, ApJ, in press,
- Ebeling, H., et al., 1996, MNRAS, 281, 799
- Ebeling, H., et al., 1998, MNRAS, 301, 881
- Edge, A. C., Ivison, R. J., Smail, I., Blain, A. W., & Kneib, J. -P., 1999, MNRAS, in press
- Edge, A. C., & Stewart, G. C., 1991a, MNRAS, 252, 414
- Edge, A. C., & Stewart, G. C., 1991b, MNRAS, 252, 428
- Edge, A. C., Stewart, G. C., Fabian, A. C., & Arnaud, K. A., 1990, MNRAS, 245, 559
- Eke, V. R., Navarro, J. F., & Frenk, C. S., 1998, ApJ, 503, 569
- Evrard, A. E., & Henry, J. P., 1991, 383, 95
- Evrard, A. E., Metzler, C. A., & Navarro, J. F., 1996, 469, 494
- Fabian, A. C., Crawford, C. S., Edge, A. C., & Mushotzky, R. F., 1994, MNRAS, 267, 779
- Fabricant, D. G., McClintock, J. E., & Bautz, M. W., 1991, ApJ, 381, 33
- Fadda, D., Girardi, M., Giuricin, G., Mardirossian, F., & Mezzetti, M., 1996, ApJ, 473, 670
- Feigelson, E. D., & Babu, G. J., 1992, ApJ, 397, 55
- Gioia, I. M., et al., 1995, A&A, 297, L75
- Gioia, I. M., Henry, J. P., Mullis, C. R., & Ebeling, H., 1999, AJ, in press

- Gioia, I. M., & Luppino, G. A., 1994, *ApJS*, 94, 583
- Girardi, M., Biviano, A., Giuricin, G., Mardirossian, F., & Mezzetti, M., 1993, *ApJ*, 404, 38
- Girardi, M., Escalera, E., Fadda, D., Giuricin, G., Mardirossian, F., & Mezzetti, M., 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 41
- Girardi, M., Fadda, D., Giuricin, G., Mardirossian, F., & Mezzetti, M., 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 61
- Gómez, P. L., Ledlow, M. J., Burns, J. O., Pinkney, J., & Hill, J. M., 1997, *AJ*, 114, 1711
- Green, M. R., Godwin, J. G., & Peach, J. V., 1988, *MNRAS*, 234, 1051
- Gudehus, D., 1989, *ApJ*, 340, 661
- Henriksen, M., Wang, Q. D., & Ulmer, M., 1999, *MNRAS*, in press
- Henry, J. P., 1997, *ApJ*, 489, L1
- Henry, J. P., & Arnaud, K. A., 1991, *ApJ*, 372, 410
- Henry, J. P., Gioia, I. M., Maccacaro, T., Morris, S. L., Stocke, J. T., & Wolter, A., 1992, *ApJ*, 386, 408
- Henry, J. P., Jiao, L., & Gioia, I. M., 1994, *ApJ*, 432, 49
- Horner, D. J., Mushotzky, R. F., & Scharf, C. A., 1999, *ApJ*, submitted (astro-ph/9902151)
- Jones, C. & Forman, W., 1984, *ApJ*, 276, 38
- Jones, C., & Forman, W., 1999, *ApJ*, 511, 65
- Kaiser, N., 1986, *MNRAS*, 222, 323
- Kaiser, N., et al., 1999, *ApJ*, in press
- Kneib, J. P., et al., 1995, *ApJ*, 303, 27
- Kull, A., & Böhringer, H., 1998, *A&A*, submitted (astro-ph/9812319)
- Lavery, R. J., & Henry, J. P., 1988, *ApJ*, 329, L21
- Le Borgne, J. F., Pelló, R., & Sanahuja, B., 1992, *A&AS*, 95, 87

- Ledlow, M. J., Loken, C., Burns, J. O., Hill, J. M., & White, R. A., 1996, *AJ*, 112, 388
- Lubin, L. M., & Bahcall, N. A., 1993, *ApJ*, 415, L17
- Lubin, L. M., Cen, R., Bahcall, N. A., & Ostriker, J. P., 1996, *ApJ*, 460, 10
- Mahdavi, A., Böhringer, H., Geller, M. J. & Ramella, M., 1997, *ApJ*, 483, 68
- Markevitch, M., 1998, *ApJ*, 504, 27
- Markevitch, M., Forman, W. R., Sarazin, C. L., & Vikhlinin, A., 1998, *ApJ*, 503, 77
- Mewe, R., Lemen, J. R., & van den Oord, G. H. J., 1986, *A&AS*, 65, 511
- Mitchell, R. J., Ives, J. C., & Culhane, J. L., 1977, *MNRAS*, 181, 25p
- Mohr, J. J., & Wegner, G., 1997, *AJ*, 114, 25
- Mohr, J. J., Mathiesen, B., & Evrard, A. E., 1999, *ApJ*, in press
- Mushotzky, R. F., & Scharf, C. A., 1997, *ApJ*, 482, L13
- Neumann, D. M., 1999, *ApJ*, submitted (astro-ph/9902035)
- Ota, N., Mitsuda, K., & Fukazawa, Y., 1998, *ApJ*, 495, 170
- Owen, F. N., Ledlow, M. J., Morrison, G. E., & Hill, J. M., 1997, *ApJ*, 488, L15
- Piccinotti, G., et al., 1992, *ApJ*, 253, 485
- Pierre, M., et al., 1997, *A&AS*, 124, 283
- Ponman, T. J., Cannon, D. B., & Navarro, J. F., 1999, *Nature*, 397, 135
- Quintana, H., & Melnick, J., 1982, *AJ*, 87, 972
- Reimers, D., Toussaint, F., Hagen, H.-J., Hippelein, H., & Meisenheimer, K., 1997, *A&A*, 326, 489
- Rizza, E., Burns, J. O., Ledlow, M. J., Owen, F. N., Voges, W., & Bliton, M., 1998, *MNRAS*, 301, 328
- Rines, K., Format, W., Pen, U., & Jones, C., 1999, *ApJ*, in press
- Rosati, P., Ceca, R. D., Norman, C., & Giacconi, R., 1998, *ApJ*, 492, L21

- Scharf, C. A., & Mushotzky, R. F., 1997, *ApJ*, 485, L65
- Schindler, S., et al., 1999, *A&A*, in press
- Schindler, S., Hattori, M., Neumann, D. M., & Böhringer, H., 1997, *A&A*, 317, 646
- Schindler, S., & Wambsganss, J., 1997, *A&A*, 322, 66
- Smail, I., et al., 1997, *ApJ*, 479, 70
- Solinger, A. B., & Tucker, W. H., 1992, *ApJ*, 175, L107
- Squires, G., Neumann, D. M., Kaiser, N., Arnaud, M., & Böhringer, H., 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 648
- Stein, P., 1997, *A&A*, 317, 670
- Struble, M. F., & Rood, H. J., 1991, *ApJS*, 77, 363
- Tran, K.-V. H., Kelson, D. D., van Dojrum, P., Franx, M., Illingworth, G. D., & Magee, D., 1999, *ApJ*, in press
- Ulrich, M.-H., 1978, *ApJ*, 221, 422
- Vikhlinin, A., McNamara, B. R., Forman, W., Jones, C., Quintana, H., & Hornstrup, A., 1998, *ApJ*, 498, L21
- Walker, T., P., Steigman, G., Schramm, D. N., Olive, K. A., & Kang, H.-S., 1991, *ApJ*, 376, 51
- Wambsganss, J., Giraud, E., Schneider, P., & Weiss, A., 1989, *ApJ*, 337, L73
- Way, M. J., Quintana, H., & Infante, L., 1997, preprint astro-ph/9709036
- White, D. A., Jones, C., & Forman, W., 1997, *MNRAS*, 292, 419
- White, S. D. M., Navarro, J. F., Evrard, A. E., & Frenk, C. S., 1993, *Nature*, 366, 429
- Wu, X.-P., 1998, in *Cosmic Microwave Background and Large Scale Structure of the Universe*, eds. Y.I.Byun and K.W.Ng, ASP Conf. Ser. 151, 140
- Wu, X.-P., Chiueh, T., Fang, L.-Z., & Xue, Y.-J., 1998, *MNRAS*, 301, 861
- Wu, X.-P., & Fang, L.-Z. 1997, *ApJ*, 483, 62
- Wu, X.-P., Fang, L.-Z., & Xu, W., 1998, *A&A*, 338, 813

Yaqoon, T., 1998, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/9812131)

Zabludoff, A. I., Huchra, J. P., & Geller, M. J., 1990, ApJS, 74, 1

Table 1. Cluster Sample

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
A13	0.0905	896^{+85}_{-73}		$5.03^{+1.17}_{-1.17}$	F96 . . . E96
A21	0.0948	621		$8.12^{+1.59}_{-1.59}$	S+R . . . E96
A76	0.0416		$1.50^{+1.10}_{-0.60}$	$1.01^{+0.22}_{-0.22}$	. . . D93 E96
A85	0.0559	810^{+76}_{-80}	$6.20^{+0.40}_{-0.50}$	$19.52^{+1.35}_{-1.35}$	B95 DJF E96
A115	0.1971	1167		$31.09^{+7.42}_{-7.42}$	S+R . . . E96
A119	0.0438	863^{+178}_{-112}	$5.59^{+0.27}_{-0.27}$	$7.17^{+0.82}_{-0.82}$	ZHG HMS E96
A133	0.0604	735^{+87}_{-72}	$4.00^{+1.40}_{-0.90}$	$6.67^{+0.75}_{-0.75}$	WQI D93 E96
A151	0.0537	708^{+69}_{-55}		$2.31^{+0.39}_{-0.39}$	GEF . . . E96
A154	0.0652	843^{+276}_{-142}		$1.83^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	DDD . . . J+F
A160	0.0447	572		$0.87^{+0.28}_{-0.23}$	S+R . . . E98
A168	0.0438	435^{+31}_{-24}	$2.60^{+1.10}_{-0.60}$	$1.50^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$	F96 D93 E98
A189	0.0335	259^{+94}_{-49}		$0.21^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	ZHG . . . E98
A193	0.0490	723^{+78}_{-61}	$4.20^{+1.00}_{-0.60}$	$3.05^{+0.60}_{-0.60}$	F96 D93 E98
A194	0.0184	341^{+57}_{-37}	$2.63^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$	$0.22^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	F96 HMS E96
A222	0.2110	570		$7.65^{+0.33}_{-0.33}$	S+R . . . DFJ
A262	0.0169	525^{+47}_{-33}	$2.41^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$0.86^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$	F96 A+E E98
A272	0.0872	694^{+193}_{-115}		$7.36^{+1.55}_{-1.55}$	ZHG . . . E96
A370	0.3730	1340^{+230}_{-150}	$7.13^{+1.05}_{-1.05}$	$20.77^{+1.95}_{-1.95}$	FMB M+S FMB
A376	0.0489		$5.00^{+2.00}_{-1.10}$	$2.88^{+0.42}_{-0.42}$	. . . D93 E98
A399	0.0718	961^{+71}_{-55}	$7.40^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$78.99^{+9.63}_{-9.63}$	GEF A+E E98
A400	0.0237	599^{+80}_{-65}	$2.31^{+0.14}_{-0.14}$	$0.60^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	F96 HMS E96
A401	0.0737	1152^{+86}_{-70}	$8.00^{+0.40}_{-0.40}$	$26.42^{+2.45}_{-2.45}$	F96 HMS E98
A407	0.0472	597		$1.15^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	S+R . . . E98
A426	0.0179	1277^{+95}_{-78}	$6.79^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	$31.75^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$	ZHG HMS E96
A458	0.1054	736^{+86}_{-58}		$6.00^{+1.20}_{-1.20}$	F96 . . . E96
A478	0.0881	904^{+261}_{-140}	$6.90^{+0.35}_{-0.35}$	$32.00^{+4.08}_{-4.08}$	ZHG HMS E98
A483	0.2830		$8.70^{+2.00}_{-1.30}$	48.90	. . . D93 D93
A496	0.0325	687^{+89}_{-76}	$4.13^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$	$6.81^{+0.60}_{-0.60}$	F96 HMS D99
A514	0.0714	882^{+84}_{-64}		$3.27^{+0.64}_{-0.64}$	F96 . . . E96
A520	0.2010	988^{+76}_{-76}	$8.59^{+0.93}_{-0.93}$	$37.35^{+8.41}_{-8.41}$	C96 M+S E98
A539	0.0284	832^{+77}_{-60}	$3.24^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$1.85^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$	ZHG HMS E96
A545	0.1530		$5.50^{+6.20}_{-1.10}$	$21.66^{+2.49}_{-2.49}$	. . . D93 E96
A548	0.0416	853^{+62}_{-51}		$2.63^{+0.79}_{-0.79}$	ZHG . . . D99
A548S	0.0415		$2.40^{+0.70}_{-0.50}$	1.30	. . . D93 D93
A569	0.0201	327^{+95}_{-39}		$0.30^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	F96 . . . A+K

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
A576	0.0384	945^{+93}_{-88}	$4.30^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	$2.71^{+0.43}_{-0.43}$	F96 D93 E98
A578	0.0864	793	$1.70^{+1.50}_{-0.60}$	$5.97^{+0.48}_{-0.48}$	G97 G97 G97
A586	0.1710		$6.61^{+1.15}_{-0.96}$	$25.27^{+4.95}_{-4.95}$	... M+S E98
A644	0.0704		$6.59^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	$18.92^{+2.17}_{-2.17}$	... A+E E96
A665	0.1816	1201	$8.26^{+0.90}_{-0.90}$	$41.72^{+6.51}_{-6.51}$	S+R A+E E98
A671	0.0501	994		$2.07^{+0.44}_{-0.44}$	S+R ... E98
A744	0.0732	814^{+173}_{-106}		$1.86^{+0.14}_{-0.14}$	ZHG ... H92
A750	0.1620	1893^{+113}_{-113}		$20.17^{+4.29}_{-4.29}$	C96 ... E98
A754	0.0535	1079^{+234}_{-243}	$9.00^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$23.07^{+1.76}_{-1.76}$	BMM M98 E96
A773	0.2170		$9.29^{+0.69}_{-0.60}$	$35.10^{+5.85}_{-5.85}$	... A+F E98
A779	0.0230	473^{+76}_{-52}		$0.28^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	M97 ... M97
A780	0.0552		$3.57^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	$11.80^{+1.00}_{-1.00}$	... HMS E96
A851	0.4510	1081^{+194}_{-194}	$6.70^{+2.70}_{-1.70}$	$16.08^{+0.61}_{-0.61}$	SRE M+S S+W
A957	0.0440	659^{+88}_{-56}		$1.80^{+0.35}_{-0.35}$	F96 ... E96
A959	0.3530		$6.95^{+1.85}_{-1.33}$	$23.75^{+3.70}_{-3.70}$	... M+S B93
A963	0.2060	1100^{+480}_{-210}	$6.13^{+0.45}_{-0.30}$	$22.37^{+4.17}_{-4.17}$	L+H A+F E98
A1060	0.0126	610^{+52}_{-43}	$3.24^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$0.82^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	F96 HMS E96
A1068	0.1390		$5.50^{+0.90}_{-0.90}$	$16.04^{+2.56}_{-2.56}$	... A+F E98
A1069	0.0662	360^{+118}_{-59}		$2.16^{+0.52}_{-0.52}$	F96 ... E96
A1142	0.0350	486^{+81}_{-41}	$3.70^{+2.00}_{-2.00}$	$0.40^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	F96 D93 J+F
A1146	0.1422	1028^{+93}_{-96}		$6.60^{+1.03}_{-1.03}$	GEF ... H92
A1185	0.0314	623^{+65}_{-50}	$3.90^{+2.00}_{-1.10}$	$0.51^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	M97 D93 E98
A1213	0.0468	549^{+203}_{-105}		0.59	Q+M ... A+K
A1240	0.1590		$3.83^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$	$2.71^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	... M+S DFJ
A1246	0.1870		$6.26^{+0.54}_{-0.49}$	$16.70^{+3.62}_{-3.62}$	... M+S E98
A1285	0.1050		$4.10^{+5.30}_{-1.70}$	$10.12^{+1.92}_{-1.92}$	... D93 E96
A1291	0.0530	919		$1.34^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	S+R ... J+F
A1300	0.3071	1200		$47.63^{+12.99}_{-13.92}$	P97 ... E96
A1314	0.0329	664^{+171}_{-105}	$5.00^{+4.50}_{-1.80}$	$0.57^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	DDD D93 E98
A1367	0.0214	822^{+69}_{-55}	$3.50^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$	$2.87^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	ZHG D93 E98
A1377	0.0514	488		$0.91^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	S+R ... J+F
A1413	0.1427		$8.85^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$36.01^{+4.54}_{-4.54}$	... A+E E98
A1507	0.0604	233		$0.54^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$	S+R ... B93
A1576	0.3020		$7.10^{+0.40}_{-0.40}$	$21.36^{+3.19}_{-3.19}$	... R99 B93
A1631	0.0464	702^{+54}_{-46}	2.80	$0.33^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	F96 ... A+K

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
A1644	0.0467	763^{+64}_{-50}	$4.70^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$7.14^{+0.85}_{-0.85}$	GEF D93 E96
A1650	0.0840		$5.50^{+1.30}_{-1.00}$	$16.83^{+1.90}_{-1.90}$	... D93 E96
A1651	0.0825	965^{+160}_{-107}	$6.10^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	$18.78^{+2.21}_{-2.21}$	ZHG M98 E96
A1656	0.0231	1010^{+51}_{-44}	$8.38^{+0.34}_{-0.34}$	$20.42^{+0.53}_{-0.53}$	ZHG HMS E98
A1689	0.1810	1800^{+200}_{-200}	$9.02^{+0.40}_{-0.30}$	$55.73^{+8.92}_{-8.92}$	G89 M+S E96
A1704	0.2190		$4.44^{+0.73}_{-0.52}$	$16.09^{+0.49}_{-0.49}$	... R98 R98
A1722	0.3270		$5.87^{+0.51}_{-0.41}$	21.00	... M+S M+S
A1736	0.0431	528^{+136}_{-87}	$4.60^{+0.60}_{-0.50}$	$4.77^{+0.62}_{-0.62}$	BMM D93 E96
A1758	0.2790		$9.33^{+1.57}_{-1.22}$	$28.66^{+1.12}_{-1.12}$	... R98 R98
A1758N	0.2800		$10.19^{+2.29}_{-1.67}$	43.90	... M+S M+S
A1763	0.1870		$8.98^{+1.02}_{-0.84}$	$39.89^{+5.70}_{-5.70}$	... M+S E98
A1767	0.0700	933^{+232}_{-134}	$4.10^{+1.70}_{-1.10}$	$4.64^{+0.54}_{-0.54}$	ZHG D93 E98
A1775	0.0696	1522^{+570}_{-273}	$4.90^{+2.70}_{-1.40}$	$5.96^{+0.85}_{-0.85}$	Q+M D93 E98
A1795	0.0631	828^{+88}_{-72}	$5.88^{+0.14}_{-0.14}$	$25.42^{+1.47}_{-1.47}$	GEF HMS E96
A1800	0.0748	724		$6.91^{+0.97}_{-0.97}$	S+R ... E98
A1809	0.0789	765^{+79}_{-66}		$3.64^{+0.80}_{-0.80}$	F96 ... E98
A1831	0.0612	316		$4.34^{+0.57}_{-0.57}$	S+R ... E98
A1835	0.2523		$9.80^{+1.40}_{-1.40}$	$104.78^{+14.33}_{-14.33}$	... A+F E98
A1837	0.0376		$2.40^{+0.90}_{-0.80}$	$2.56^{+0.62}_{-0.62}$	... E+S E96
A1904	0.0714	724^{+149}_{-94}		$1.33^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	Q+M ... DFJ
A1913	0.0527	454^{+128}_{-75}		$0.79^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	ZHG ... J+F
A1940	0.1384	534^{+176}_{-93}		$3.52^{+0.23}_{-0.23}$	DDD ... DFJ
A1983	0.0452	551^{+71}_{-47}		$1.08^{+0.26}_{-0.26}$	GEF ... E98
A1991	0.0586	658^{+228}_{-114}	$5.40^{+5.90}_{-2.20}$	$2.98^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	GBG D93 E98
A1995	0.3180		$10.70^{+2.50}_{-1.80}$	33.30	... M+S M+S
A2009	0.1530	804	$7.80^{+2.10}_{-4.40}$	$22.67^{+4.27}_{-4.27}$	S+R D93 E96
A2029	0.0765	1164^{+98}_{-78}	$8.47^{+0.41}_{-0.36}$	$41.93^{+2.96}_{-2.96}$	F96 A+F E98
A2040	0.0456	458^{+141}_{-102}		$0.88^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	F96 ... J+F
A2052	0.0348	561^{+87}_{-73}	$3.10^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	$4.27^{+0.34}_{-0.34}$	GEF D93 E98
A2055	0.0530		5.80	$10.85^{+1.85}_{-1.85}$	... D93 E98
A2061	0.0777	554^{+131}_{-77}		$8.87^{+1.29}_{-1.29}$	ZHG ... E98
A2063	0.0355	667^{+55}_{-41}	$3.68^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$	$3.69^{+0.36}_{-0.36}$	F96 HMS E98
A2065	0.0722	1108^{+273}_{-349}	$8.40^{+1.70}_{-1.20}$	$13.52^{+1.70}_{-1.70}$	DDD D93 E98
A2069	0.1160	831		$19.78^{+2.79}_{-2.79}$	S+R ... E98
A2079	0.0656	670^{+113}_{-67}		$2.71^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	F96 ... A+K

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
A2092	0.0670	504^{+115}_{-69}		$0.90^{+0.16}_{-0.16}$	ZHG ... H92
A2107	0.0421	577^{+177}_{-127}	$3.78^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$	$2.02^{+0.31}_{-0.31}$	BMM HMS E98
A2111	0.2290		$5.38^{+0.50}_{-0.47}$	$21.79^{+5.28}_{-5.28}$	... HWU E98
A2124	0.0654	809^{+73}_{-60}		$3.07^{+0.71}_{-0.71}$	GEF ... E98
A2142	0.0899	1132^{+110}_{-92}	$9.70^{+1.30}_{-1.30}$	$61.12^{+3.95}_{-3.95}$	F96 HMS E96
A2147	0.0356	1074^{+292}_{-162}	$4.40^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	$5.61^{+0.40}_{-0.40}$	DDD D93 E96
A2151	0.0370	827^{+69}_{-55}	$3.80^{+0.70}_{-0.50}$	$1.61^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	ZHG D93 E96
A2152	0.0374	715^{+81}_{-61}		0.58	B+H ... Q+M
A2162	0.0323	362^{+67}_{-43}		$0.21^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	M97 ... M97
A2163	0.2030	1680	$14.60^{+0.85}_{-0.85}$	$132.91^{+19.42}_{-19.42}$	SNK A+E E96
A2197	0.0305	564^{+84}_{-59}		$0.32^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	ZHG ... A+K
A2199	0.0299	794^{+77}_{-60}	$4.10^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$	$7.09^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$	ZHG HMS E98
A2204	0.1523		$9.20^{+1.50}_{-1.50}$	$58.63^{+6.35}_{-6.35}$	... A+F E98
A2218	0.1710	1370^{+160}_{-210}	$7.10^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	$21.96^{+2.01}_{-2.01}$	LPS A+F E98
A2219	0.2280		$12.40^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$64.56^{+6.96}_{-6.96}$	... A+F E98
A2244	0.0970	1240	$8.47^{+0.43}_{-0.42}$	$25.32^{+2.14}_{-2.14}$	S+R M+S E98
A2246	0.2500		$5.20^{+2.60}_{-2.60}$	1.19	... R97 R97
A2246B	0.4400		$2.60^{+1.30}_{-1.30}$	1.46	... R97 R97
A2255	0.0808	1221^{+181}_{-126}	$7.30^{+1.10}_{-1.70}$	$12.42^{+0.55}_{-0.55}$	DDD D93 E98
A2256	0.0581	1348^{+86}_{-64}	$7.51^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$	$18.39^{+0.80}_{-0.80}$	F96 D93 E98
A2271	0.0568	460		$1.23^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	S+R ... J+F
A2280	0.3260	948^{+516}_{-285}		16.76	G95 ... G95
A2319	0.0559	1545^{+95}_{-77}	$9.12^{+0.15}_{-0.15}$	$39.74^{+2.17}_{-2.17}$	F96 A+E E96
A2390	0.2279	1093^{+61}_{-61}	$11.10^{+1.00}_{-1.00}$	$63.49^{+14.87}_{-14.87}$	C96 B98 E98
A2420	0.0838		$6.00^{+2.30}_{-1.20}$	$12.91^{+2.43}_{-2.43}$	... D93 D99
A2426	0.0886	332^{+80}_{-28}		$13.43^{+1.72}_{-1.72}$	F96 ... D99
A2440	0.0904	991^{+200}_{-117}	9.00	$11.13^{+2.59}_{-2.59}$	GBG D93 E96
A2507	0.1960		$9.40^{+1.60}_{-1.20}$	$21.65^{+0.49}_{-0.49}$	... D93 R98
A2556	0.0865	1247^{+249}_{-249}		$5.56^{+2.36}_{-2.36}$	D78 ... E96
A2589	0.0416	500^{+110}_{-67}	$3.70^{+1.30}_{-0.70}$	$3.42^{+0.38}_{-0.38}$	ZHG D93 E98
A2593	0.0433	710^{+113}_{-68}	$3.10^{+1.50}_{-0.90}$	$1.98^{+0.29}_{-0.29}$	GBG D93 E98
A2597	0.0852		$4.40^{+0.40}_{-0.70}$	$15.37^{+1.79}_{-1.79}$	... M98 E96
A2626	0.0573	658^{+111}_{-81}	$2.90^{+2.50}_{-1.00}$	$3.21^{+0.44}_{-0.44}$	M+W D93 E98
A2634	0.0309	700^{+97}_{-61}	$3.07^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$	$1.59^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	F96 A+E E96
A2657	0.0414	667	$3.40^{+0.50}_{-0.30}$	$2.82^{+0.35}_{-0.35}$	S+R D93 E98

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
A2666	0.0270	476^{+95}_{-60}		0.05	ZHG ... Q+M
A2670	0.0759	918^{+65}_{-47}	$4.45^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	$4.97^{+0.92}_{-0.92}$	GEF HMS E96
A2717	0.0498	541^{+65}_{-41}		$2.32^{+0.39}_{-0.39}$	F96 ... E96
A2721	0.1152	805^{+74}_{-63}		$8.48^{+1.70}_{-1.70}$	F96 ... E96
A2734	0.0625	628^{+61}_{-57}		$5.82^{+0.87}_{-0.87}$	F96 ... E96
A2744	0.3080	1950^{+334}_{-334}	$11.00^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$62.44^{+14.41}_{-14.41}$	FMB A+F E96
A2877	0.0248	744^{+63}_{-51}	$3.50^{+1.10}_{-0.80}$	$0.82^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	GEF D93 E96
A3093	0.0836	440^{+80}_{-56}		$0.21^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	F96 ... DFJ
A3112	0.0746	552^{+86}_{-63}	$4.24^{+0.24}_{-0.24}$	$14.67^{+1.20}_{-1.20}$	F96 D99 E96
A3126	0.0862	1053^{+164}_{-108}		$7.18^{+1.08}_{-1.08}$	F96 ... E96
A3128	0.0604	841^{+51}_{-44}		$4.84^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	GEF ... E96
A3158	0.0575	976^{+70}_{-58}	$5.50^{+0.30}_{-0.40}$	$11.60^{+0.74}_{-0.74}$	F96 D93 E96
A3223	0.0603	647^{+67}_{-54}		$1.87^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	F96 ... DFJ
A3266	0.0594	1138^{+94}_{-74}	$8.00^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	$16.48^{+0.64}_{-0.64}$	GEF M98 E96
A3360	0.0849	835^{+114}_{-82}		$2.07^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	F96 ... DFJ
A3376	0.0490	723^{+82}_{-61}	$4.00^{+0.40}_{-0.40}$	$4.66^{+0.41}_{-0.41}$	GEF HMS E96
A3389	0.0267	595^{+63}_{-47}	$2.10^{+0.90}_{-0.60}$	$0.48^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	F96 D93 E96
A3391	0.0553	786^{+78}_{-53}	$5.40^{+0.60}_{-0.60}$	$5.03^{+0.41}_{-0.41}$	GEF HMS E96
A3395	0.0506	823^{+51}_{-43}	$5.00^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	$5.85^{+0.40}_{-0.40}$	GEF HMS E96
A3526	0.0114	586^{+45}_{-35}	$3.68^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$1.53^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	ZHG HMS E96
A3528N	0.0553	972^{+110}_{-82}		0.49	F96 ... Q+M
A3532	0.0559	738^{+112}_{-85}	$4.40^{+4.70}_{-1.30}$	$5.54^{+0.82}_{-0.82}$	F96 E90 E96
A3556	0.0476	580^{+100}_{-73}		$2.16^{+0.53}_{-0.53}$	F96 ... E96
A3558	0.0475	735^{+49}_{-41}	$5.12^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	$13.27^{+1.16}_{-1.16}$	GEF HMS E96
A3559	0.0469	456^{+78}_{-44}		$0.45^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	F96 ... DFJ
A3562	0.0478	736^{+49}_{-36}	$3.80^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$6.11^{+0.77}_{-0.77}$	F96 D93 E96
A3571	0.0396	1045^{+109}_{-90}	$6.73^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	$18.09^{+1.20}_{-1.20}$	F96 HMS E96
A3651	0.0610	626^{+60}_{-53}		$3.35^{+1.41}_{-1.41}$	F96 ... D99
A3667	0.0566	971^{+62}_{-47}	$7.00^{+0.60}_{-0.60}$	$22.70^{+4.20}_{-4.20}$	F96 HMS E98
A3693	0.0921	478^{+107}_{-50}		$4.54^{+1.65}_{-1.65}$	F96 ... D99
A3695	0.0903	779^{+67}_{-49}		$11.39^{+1.96}_{-1.96}$	F96 ... E96
A3716	0.0493	954^{+141}_{-85}		$2.32^{+0.41}_{-0.41}$	GBG ... E96
A3733	0.0380	608^{+109}_{-60}		$0.97^{+0.23}_{-0.23}$	F96 ... E96
A3744	0.0387	508^{+74}_{-48}		$8.85^{+1.54}_{-1.54}$	F96 ... D99
A3809	0.0631	478^{+62}_{-45}		$5.13^{+0.89}_{-0.89}$	F96 ... E96

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
A3822	0.0769	810^{+89}_{-58}		$9.03^{+1.24}_{-1.24}$	F96 ... E96
A3825	0.0760	699^{+79}_{-58}		$4.03^{+0.86}_{-0.86}$	F96 ... E96
A3827	0.0984	962^{+407}_{-407}		$22.82^{+2.52}_{-2.52}$	AMB ... D99
A3880	0.0380	855^{+148}_{-148}	3.80	$3.43^{+0.52}_{-0.52}$	S97 ... E96
A3888	0.1680	1307^{+100}_{-92}		$31.40^{+4.91}_{-4.91}$	GEF ... E96
A3921	0.0944	490^{+126}_{-73}	$4.90^{+0.55}_{-0.55}$	$10.92^{+1.52}_{-1.52}$	F96 A+E E96
A4010	0.0966	625^{+127}_{-95}		$12.43^{+4.05}_{-4.05}$	F96 ... E96
A4038	0.0302	898^{+112}_{-116}	$3.30^{+1.60}_{-0.80}$	$3.31^{+0.26}_{-0.26}$	GEF D93 E96
A4059	0.0478	845^{+280}_{-140}	$3.97^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	$5.78^{+0.54}_{-0.54}$	GGP HMS E96
1ES0657–558	0.2994		$11.00^{+1.50}_{-1.30}$	$126.81^{+14.63}_{-14.63}$	... Y98 D99
2A0335+096	0.0350		$3.01^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	$7.05^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	... HMS E98
3C129	0.0218		$5.60^{+0.40}_{-0.40}$	$4.31^{+0.39}_{-0.39}$	... D93 E+S
3C295	0.4600	1670^{+364}_{-364}	$7.13^{+2.06}_{-1.35}$	$26.00^{+4.00}_{-2.00}$	SRE M+S N99
AC114	0.3100	1649^{+217}_{-156}	$9.76^{+1.04}_{-0.85}$	38.10	FMB A+F A+F
AWM4	0.0424		$2.38^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	$0.68^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	... HMS E98
AWM7	0.0176	864^{+113}_{-81}	$3.75^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$3.00^{+0.45}_{-0.45}$	GBG HMS E+S
AXJ2019–1127	0.9400		$8.60^{+4.20}_{-3.00}$	$19.42^{+5.55}_{-3.93}$	... H97 H97
CA0340–538	0.0570	1006^{+222}_{-135}		$9.16^{+1.04}_{-1.04}$	DDD ... P92
CL0016+16	0.5545	1234^{+128}_{-128}	$8.00^{+1.00}_{-1.00}$	$28.13^{+3.14}_{-3.14}$	C96 M+S H92
CL0024+16	0.3910	1339^{+233}_{-233}		$4.26^{+0.91}_{-0.91}$	SRE ... FMB
CL0107–46	0.0230	1032^{+125}_{-108}		$0.85^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	B95 ... J+F
CL0336+09	0.0349		$3.00^{+0.20}_{-0.10}$	$7.12^{+0.64}_{-0.64}$	... D93 E+S
CL0422–09	0.0390		$2.90^{+0.50}_{-0.40}$	$3.15^{+0.73}_{-0.73}$	... D93 E+S
CL0500–24	0.3270	1300^{+300}_{-300}	$7.20^{+3.70}_{-1.80}$	$17.51^{+1.33}_{-0.89}$	W89 OMF S+W
CL0745–19	0.1028		$8.50^{+1.90}_{-1.40}$	$59.00^{+19.10}_{-19.10}$	... E+S E+S
CL1322+30	0.7570	820^{+120}_{-120}		$1.43^{+0.44}_{-0.44}$	C94 ... C94
CL1447+26	0.3762	1470		$10.69^{+1.98}_{-1.98}$	D99 ... FMB
CL2244–02	0.3280		$6.50^{+1.80}_{-1.30}$	2.91	... OMF OMF
Cygnus–A	0.0570	1581^{+286}_{-197}	$6.50^{+0.36}_{-0.36}$	16.50	O97 MME D93
IRAS09104+4109	0.4420		$8.50^{+3.40}_{-3.40}$	55.10	... A+F A+F
MKW3S	0.0434	603^{+61}_{-59}	$3.00^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	$4.47^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	GEF D93 E98
MKW4	0.0196	535^{+65}_{-59}	$1.71^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$0.49^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	GBG HMS B96
MKW4S	0.0288		$1.95^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	$0.31^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	... HMS E98
MKW7	0.0289	573^{+363}_{-172}		$0.15^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	L96 ... B96
MKW8	0.0272	422^{+99}_{-53}		$1.40^{+0.20}_{-0.20}$	L96 ... E98

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
MKW9	0.0397	336	$2.23^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	0.10	B99 HMS B99
MKW10	0.0206	177^{+85}_{-46}		$0.14^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	L96 ... B96
MKW11	0.0232	384^{+70}_{-42}		$0.29^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	L96 ... B96
MS0302+16	0.4246	646^{+93}_{-93}		$9.08^{+1.00}_{-1.00}$	C96 ... H92
MS0302+17	0.4250		$4.60^{+0.80}_{-0.80}$	$4.23^{+0.69}_{-0.69}$	... K99 H92
MS0353–36	0.3200		$8.13^{+2.57}_{-1.73}$	$14.52^{+0.65}_{-0.65}$	... M+S H97
MS0440+02	0.1965	606^{+62}_{-62}	$5.30^{+1.27}_{-0.85}$	$7.43^{+0.95}_{-0.95}$	C96 M+S H92
MS0451+02	0.2011	979	$8.60^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	$15.93^{+2.70}_{-2.70}$	C96 M+S H92
MS0451–03	0.5392	1371^{+105}_{-105}	$10.17^{+1.55}_{-1.26}$	53.70	C96 M+S M+S
MS0811+63	0.3120		$4.60^{+0.90}_{-0.60}$	$2.91^{+0.58}_{-0.58}$	... H97 H92
MS0839+29	0.1928	749^{+104}_{-104}	$4.19^{+0.36}_{-0.33}$	$9.14^{+1.25}_{-1.25}$	C96 M+S H92
MS1006+12	0.2605	906^{+101}_{-101}		$9.16^{+1.47}_{-1.47}$	C96 ... H92
MS1008–12	0.3062	1054^{+107}_{-107}	$7.29^{+2.45}_{-1.52}$	$9.13^{+1.24}_{-1.24}$	C96 M+S H92
MS1054–03	0.8260	1170^{+150}_{-150}	$12.30^{+3.10}_{-2.20}$	19.91	T99 D98 G+L
MS1147+11	0.3030		$5.50^{+0.80}_{-0.60}$	$4.19^{+1.00}_{-1.00}$	... H97 H92
MS1224+20	0.3255	802^{+90}_{-90}	$4.30^{+0.70}_{-0.60}$	$8.06^{+0.52}_{-0.52}$	C96 H97 H97
MS1231+15	0.2350	667^{+69}_{-69}		$5.52^{+1.29}_{-1.29}$	C96 ... H92
MS1241+17	0.3120		$6.20^{+1.80}_{-1.30}$	$6.47^{+1.65}_{-1.65}$	... H97 H92
MS1305+29	0.2410		$2.98^{+0.57}_{-0.41}$	$2.24^{+0.33}_{-0.33}$	... M+S H92
MS1358+62	0.3283	937^{+54}_{-54}	$7.50^{+4.30}_{-4.30}$	$21.81^{+3.81}_{-3.81}$	C96 A+F H92
MS1426+01	0.3200		$5.50^{+1.10}_{-0.70}$	$6.71^{+0.85}_{-0.85}$	... H97 H92
MS1455+22	0.2570	1133^{+140}_{-140}	$5.45^{+0.29}_{-0.28}$	$29.42^{+1.45}_{-1.45}$	C96 M+S H92
MS1512+36	0.3726	690^{+96}_{-96}	$3.57^{+1.33}_{-0.74}$	$7.62^{+1.67}_{-1.67}$	C96 M+S H92
MS1621+26	0.4274	793^{+55}_{-55}		$8.22^{+1.55}_{-1.55}$	C96 ... H92
MS2137–23	0.3130	960	$4.37^{+0.38}_{-0.72}$	$26.27^{+3.59}_{-3.59}$	K95 M+S H92
Ophiuchus	0.0280		$9.10^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	$32.20^{+5.20}_{-5.20}$	... A+E E+S
PKS0745–191	0.1028		$8.70^{+1.60}_{-1.20}$	64.05	... A+F A98
RXJ0658–5557	0.3100		$17.00^{+4.00}_{-4.00}$	$126.60^{+5.52}_{-5.52}$	... A99 A99
RXJ1347–1145	0.4510		$11.37^{+1.10}_{-0.92}$	$197.71^{+21.67}_{-21.67}$	... M+S SHN
RXJ1716.6+6708	0.8130	1522^{+215}_{-150}	$5.66^{+1.37}_{-0.58}$	$17.40^{+0.91}_{-0.91}$	G99 G99 G99
S84	0.1086	329^{+60}_{-25}		$6.03^{+1.16}_{-1.16}$	F96 ... D99
S301	0.0223	506^{+223}_{-125}		$0.38^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$	GBG ... D99
S805	0.0141	470^{+66}_{-103}	$1.40^{+0.30}_{-0.30}$	0.20	GBG D93 D93
S987	0.0717	677^{+141}_{-66}		$2.85^{+1.41}_{-1.41}$	F96 ... D99
S1101	0.0580		$3.00^{+1.20}_{-0.70}$	$5.35^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	... E+S D99

Table 1—Continued

cluster	redshift	σ (km/s)	T (keV)	L_x (10^{44} erg/s)	references
SC0316–444	0.0730	788^{+174}_{-108}		13.08	Q+M $\cdots$ Q+M
SC1327–312	0.0495	580^{+119}_{-118}	$3.85^{+2.40}_{-1.32}$	3.14	D97 BZM K+B
SC2008–569	0.0530	1470^{+291}_{-183}		$27.84^{+1.83}_{-1.83}$	Q+M $\cdots$ Q+M
SC2059–25	0.1880		$7.00^{+4.20}_{-1.30}$	25.30	$\cdots$ D93 D93
SC2311–43	0.0556		$2.50^{+0.90}_{-0.60}$	4.71	$\cdots$ D93 D93
Triangulum-Aust	0.0510		$10.05^{+0.69}_{-0.69}$	$26.90^{+4.80}_{-4.80}$	$\cdots$ HMS E+S
Virgo	0.0038	673^{+48}_{-40}	$2.20^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$1.52^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	DDD A+E E98
WP23	0.0087		$1.00^{+0.60}_{-0.40}$	0.23	$\cdots$ D93 D93
ZW0628+25	0.0810		$6.20^{+3.60}_{-1.70}$	7.86	$\cdots$ D93 D93
ZW1615+35	0.0321	584	$2.90^{+2.60}_{-1.10}$	0.40	U78 D93 D93
ZW3146	0.2906		$6.35^{+0.37}_{-0.34}$	$55.81^{+9.49}_{-9.49}$	$\cdots$ M+S E98

References. — (respectively velocity dispersion, temperature and X-ray luminosity): A98 — Allen (1998); A99 — Andreani et al. (1999); A+E — Arnaud & Evrard (1999); A+F — Allen & Fabian (1998); A+K — Abramopoulos & Ku (1983); AMB — Adami et al. (1998); B93 — Briel & Henry (1993); B95 — Bird (1995); B96 — Burns et al. (1996); B98 — Böhringer et al. (1998); B99 — Buote (1999); B+H — Barmby & Huchra (1998); BMM — Bird, Mushotzky & Metzler (1995); BZM — Bardelli et al. (1996); C94 — Castander et al. (1994); C96 — Carlberg et al. (1996); D78 — Dressler (1978); D93 — David et al. (1993); DJF — David, Jones & Forman (1995); D98 — Donahue et al. (1998); D99 — De Grandi et al. (1999); DDD — Danese, De Zotti & di Tullio (1980); DFJ — David, Forman & Jones (1999); DSP — Dressler et al. (1999); E90 — Edge et al. (1990); E96 — Ebeling et al. (1996); E98 — Ebeling et al. (1998); E+S — Edge & Stewart (1991a); F96 — Fadda et al. (1996); FMB — Fabricant, McClintock & Bautz (1991); G95 — Gioia et al. (1995); G89 — Gudehus (1989); G97 — Gómez et al. (1997); G99 — Gioia et al. (1999); GBG — Girardi et al. (1993); GEF — Girardi et al. (1997); GGP — Green, Godwin & Peach (1988) G+L — Gioia & Luppino (1994); H92 — Henry et al. (1992); H97 — Henry (1997); HMS — Horner, Mushotzky & Scharf (1999); HWU — Henriksen, Wang & Ulmer (1999); J+F — Jones & Forman (1984); K95 — Kneib (1995); K99 — Kaiser et al. (1999); K+B — Kull & Böhringer (1998); L96 — Ledlow et al. (1996); L+H — Lavery & Henry (1988); LPS — Le Borgne, Pelló & Sanahuja (1992); M97 — Mahdavi et al. (1997); M98 — Markevitch et al. (1998); MME — Mohr, Mathiesen & Evrard (1999); M+S — Mushotzky & Scharf (1997); M+W — Mohr & Wegner (1997); N99 — Neumann (1999); O97 — Owen et al. (1997); OMF — Ota, Mitsuda & Fukazawa (1998); P92 — Piccinotti et al. (1992); P97 — Pierre et al. (1997); Q+M — Quintana & Melnick (1982); R97 — Reimers et al. (1997); R98 — Rizza et al. (1998); R99 — Rines et al. (1999); S97 — Stein (1996); S99 — Schindler et al. (1999); SHN — Schindler et al. (1997); SNK — Squires et al. (1997); SRE — Smail et al. (1997); S+R — Struble & Rood (1991); S+W — Schindler & Wambsganss (1997); T99 — Tran et al. (1999); U78 — Ulrich (1978); W89 — Wambsganss et al. (1989); WQI — Way, Quintana & Infante (1997); Y98 — Yaqoon (1998); ZHG — Zabludoff, Huchra & Geller (1990).

Table 2 Summary of the best fitted L - T relationships

authors	cluster No.	method	fitted relation
Henry & Arnaud (1991)	24	OLS	$L_x = 10^{-0.99 \pm 0.29} T^{2.7 \pm 0.4}$ $T = (1.05^{+0.25}_{-0.20}) L_x^{0.265 \pm 0.035}$
Edge & Stewart (1991a)	45	OLS	$L_x = 10^{-0.95 \pm 0.08} T^{2.62 \pm 0.10}$ $T = (2.95^{+2.06}_{-1.21}) L_x^{0.30 \pm 0.05}$
David et al (1993)	104	OLS	$T = (2.94^{+0.28}_{-0.26}) L_x^{0.297 \pm 0.004}$
White et al (1997)	86	ORD	$L_x = (4.78 \pm 0.99) \times 10^{-2} T^{2.98 \pm 0.11}$ $T = (2.76 \pm 0.08) L_x^{0.33 \pm 0.01}$
Allen & Fabian (1998)	30	BCES ^a	$T = (1.66 \pm 0.52) L_x^{0.429 \pm 0.079}$
Arnaud & Evrard (1998)	24	OLS	$L_x = 10^{1.06 \pm 0.03} (T/6)^{2.88 \pm 0.15}$
Markevitch (1998) ^b	30	BCES	$L_x = (12.44 \pm 1.08) (T/6)^{2.64 \pm 0.27}$
Jone & Forman (1999) ^c	78	OLS	$T = (0.13^{+0.08}_{-0.07}) L_x^{0.531 \pm 0.068}$
This work	168	OLS	$L_x = 10^{-0.92 \pm 0.09} T^{2.61 \pm 0.12}$ $T = 10^{0.45 \pm 0.01} L_x^{0.28 \pm 0.01}$
	142	ORD	$L_x = 10^{-0.92 \pm 0.05} T^{2.72 \pm 0.05}$ $T = 10^{0.34 \pm 0.01} L_x^{0.37 \pm 0.01}$

^aThe modified OLS method - bivariate correlated errors and intrinsic scatter [see Akritas & Bershadsky (1996)];

^bCooling flow regions are excluded;

^c L_x , in units of 10^{40} erg/s, is the 0.5–4.5 keV luminosity and measured within 1 Mpc.

Fig. 1.— The L_x - T relationship for 168 clusters whose L_x and T are observationally determined (Table 1). The low-redshift ($z < 0.1$) and high-redshift ($z \geq 0.1$) clusters are represented by the open squares (100) and the filled circles (68), respectively. The dashed line is the best OLS fitted relationship to the whole data set, $L_x = 0.12T^{2.61}$.

Fig. 2.— The L_x - T relationship for a subsample of 142 clusters for which the measurement uncertainties in both L_x and T are known. The symbols have the same meaning as in Fig.1. The solid and dashed lines represent the best fitted results by the ODR and OLS methods, respectively.

Fig. 3.— The L_x - σ relationship for 193 clusters whose L_x and σ are given in Table 1. The low-redshift ($z < 0.1$) and high-redshift ($z \geq 0.1$) clusters are represented by the open squares (147) and the filled circles (46), respectively. The dashed line is the best OLS fitted relationship to the whole data set, $L_x = 10^{-7.06}\sigma^{2.67}$.

Fig. 4.— The L_x - σ relationship for a subsample of 156 clusters for which the measurement uncertainties in both L_x and σ are known. The dashed line shows the best OLS fit to the data, and the solid line is the doubly weighted ODR result.

Fig. 5.— The σ - T relationship for the 105 clusters in Table 1. The symbols have the same meaning as in Fig.1. The dashed line shows the OLS fitted relationship to the data set and the solid one is the ODR result for 92 clusters that have measurement uncertainties in both σ and T .

Fig. 6.— Mean cluster X-ray luminosity L_x , temperature T and velocity dispersion σ are plotted against $(1+z)$ for our cluster sample. Each redshift bin contains 16, 14 and 19 clusters for (L_x, z) , (T, z) and (σ, z) , respectively. Vertical error bar demonstrates the difference between the maximum and minimum values observed within each bin.

Fig. 7.— The ratios of L_x to (a) $T^{3.06}$, (b) $T^{2.5}$ and (c) $T^2(1+z)^{3/2}$ for our cluster sample. The horizontal axis is plotted in order of clusters in Table 1 where their L_x and T are available. The open squares and the filled triangles represent the low- and high-redshift clusters, respectively. The

dotted lines show the mean values.













